Remarks

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been objected to. Claims 1-10 have been rejected.

Claim 1 was objected to because of minor informalities. Applicant has made the appropriate correction.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,914,748, in view of Brady et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,684,898.

As amended claim 1 requires that the probability function for each pixel be calculated 'directly from a formula.' It is believed that this overcomes the Examiner's concerns about the tern 'directly' being too broad. The combination of references teaches using a look up table (see Brady on column 8, lines 8-11, the other references do not make a probability determination). First, using a look-up table is not 'calculating' a probability, and second, the combination of references does not teach this.

The term 'calculating' in its usual meaning is typically defined as "determining by mathematical processes,' (Merriam-Webster, 2004). It is not believed that indexing into a table and selecting a value based upon an index automatically, as is done in a look-up table process, is 'performing a mathematical process.'

Further, the combination of references does not teach calculating the probability directly from a formula. As discussed in previous papers, there are advantages in calculating the probability directly for each pixel. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al., in view of Brady et al., in further view of Gehrmann U.S. Patent No. 5,382,980.

As claim 3 depends from claim 1, it therefore inherently includes the limitation of having the probability calculated 'directly from a formula.' As the combination of references only includes Brady to address the calculation of the probability, it is therefore submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al., Brady et al. in further view of Jang U.S. Patent No. 5,825,909.

As claim 7 depends from claim 1, it therefore inherently includes the limitation of having the probability calculated 'directly from a formula.' As the combination of references only includes Brady to address the calculation of the probability, it is therefore submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al., in view of Brady et al., in further view of Gardos et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,710,602.

As claim 8 depends from claim 1, it therefore inherently includes the limitation of having the probability calculated 'directly from a formula.' As the combination of references only includes Brady to address the calculation of the probability, it is therefore submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613